Academic Writing for Graduate Students: Answer key (Chapter 5)

- Task 2:

1. Text 1 is usually rejected because it primarily restates many of the facts given in the source. While the facts are important, they do not reveal a perspective toward the issue, nor do they suggest what point the author may want to argue. Text 4 clearly reveals a perspective, especially the claim that there is an *insatiable demand for caffeine.* One may say s/he would be uncomfortable writing such a strong claim and then using it to state that a public health crisis may soon emerge. The link between energy drinks and caffeine has not been made and yet readers are expected to accept a conclusion. Text 3 seems rather thin; it is not clear why readers should be concerned about energy drinks. Readers are assumed to know that many are highly caffeinated, that they contain other ingredients that may interact with caffeine, and that the combination of these elements may have harmful effects on human health. Text 5 makes the connection between caffeine content and possible harm, but it is a bit short on detail. Perhaps with some additional information this one would be okay. This leaves us with the second text, which is considered pretty good. The opening sentence could be improved though. The *according to* opening can be easily changed so that the first few words say something potentially more engaging. The level of detail seems okay, although one can think it is too much.

- Task 3:

1. It would be considered reasonable to draw the line between the third and fourth statements. Clearly Statement 3 is a gray area. The degree to which a person follows the fourth approach is very important. In discussions of plagiarism, the notion of *intent to deceive* is often raised. It is important to consider the difference between plagiarism and using of common academic expressions.

- Task 5 (part 1):

Some examples are:

1. Driving safety may be decreased because drivers are distracted by technology such as cell phones and MP3 players and pay less attention to the road and the traffic.

   Because drivers have access to nondriving technology such as cell phones in their cars, they may be easily distracted and be less aware of the traffic flow and the roads.
2. Drivers are increasingly distracted by technology in their vehicles that is not related to driving, leading to decreased attention to the road and other traffic.
   The availability of technology in cars such as cell phones can lead to driver inattention and decreased focus on safe driving practices.

- Task 7:

  Answers will vary.

- Task 8:

  Here is how verbs can be categorized. It is important to understand that a verb is not evaluative if the authors of the original text state that they are claiming or contending; reflecting the perspective of the original could be the objective.

	Objective	Evaluative
describe	X	
recommend	X	
claim		X
assume		X
contend		X
propose	X	
Theorize	X	
support	X	
examine	X	

- Task 9:

1. This first one could be improved. The reference to the *author Chad Reissig* could be shortened to *Reissig et al. (2009).* The *how* should be omitted because *that* was used.
2. There is no need to restate the title. There is a concern whether *claims* is the best reporting verb here, but this could very well be ok for someone who questions the potential danger.
3. The same problem with the title being restated along with the question about the use of the author's first name is placed. The part focusing on the article content, however, seems fine.
4. The use of *mention* here seems to be a weakness since the authors give a lot of information on consumption. Perhaps *state* would be a good choice.
5. *Said* is fine in speaking, but apart from its use in Philosophy, it is not that common as a reporting verb.